

Mills, William  
South Bend, IN  
Page 1 of 1

Hartman, Gary S

From: bmills@comdistec.com  
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2001 1:39 PM  
To: Y12EIS  
Subject: comment on EIS for Y-12 plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Dear Mr. Hartman:

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed National Security Complex (i.e. bomb plant). Rather than building more nuclear weapons, we should be decommissioning them. The most obvious reason is to avoid a disastrous nuclear war. It is almost almost as obvious, given the long half lives of many of the radioactive elements involved, that there is no way to dispose of the radioactive waste created by nuclear weapons production without large releases into the environment. Nor is there any way to avoid radioactive releases during nuclear weapons production.

Sincerely yours,

William Mills  
713 W. LaSalle Ave.  
South Bend, IN 46601

1/16

### Comment No. 1

Issue Code: 16

Comment noted. The proposed action and alternatives analyzed in the Y-12 SWEIS address the continued operation of the assigned nuclear weapons stockpile management requirement of Y-12. There is no proposal to expand capabilities or to increase nuclear weapons production at Y-12. In accordance with Section 91 of the *Atomic Energy Act*, DOE carries out its mission (i.e., atomic weapons activities) consistent with the consent of and direction from the President and Congress. This consent and direction are contained in the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Memorandum. The issue of whether DOE should produce nuclear weapons is beyond the scope of the Y-12 SWEIS.

The radiological releases to the environment that could result from the proposed action and alternatives under normal operating conditions and various hypothetical accident scenarios are conservatively estimated in Volume I, Chapter 5 of the Y-12 SWEIS. The potential impacts to the environment and the radiological doses and risks to the public from these releases are assessed and discussed in Chapter 5, Section 5.12. The assumptions and methodology used for the assessment are described in detail in Volume II, Appendix D. As described in Chapter 5, Section 5.12 of the SWEIS, the environmental impacts and the potential radiological dose to the public are well within the limits considered acceptable by regulatory authorities. The conservatively estimated dose to the MEI for Alternative 4 would be approximately 4.5 mrem/year, which is below the NESHAP standard of 10 mrem/year.